CANDOUR The British Views-Letter

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Vol. XXIII No. 520 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* March 1972

OPEN LETTER TO EDWARD HEATH

By A. K. CHESTERTON

SIR,

You gave the British people, whose interests you so disastrously misrepresent, the pledge that on no account would you take the United Kingdom into the European Economic Community unless you had their overwhelming consent and the overwhelming consent of Parliament.

In the strange new world which we inhabit words seem to have no meaning in their own right, so that it would be futile to consult dictionaries for a definition of the word "overwhelming". We have been transported to the realm of Lewis Carroll, wherein Humpty Dumpty declares "When I use a word it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less".

Thus to suit your own convenience a majority of eight in the House of Commons represents "overwhelming" support. As for the British people, since they have never been consulted, you apparently assume their silence to mean that they are overwhelmingly behind you, anxious to become embroiled in the European cosmopolis and sever the links between themselves and their kinsmen overseas. As far as it has been possible to ascertain, they want nothing of the sort, but that fact will cause you no headache. You are content with the overwhelming support given you by a majority of eight.

* * *

You can claim, Heaven knows, that you laboured hard to get that majority. On the eve of the vote you made it known that if it went against entry into Europe you and your colleagues would resign, thereby precipitating a general election from which the Labour Party, cashing-in on the soaring unemployment figures (the result of your Government's inept handling of the situation arising from the strike of the coal-miners) would almost certainly emerge victorious. The only inference was that many Conservatives would lose their seats and that those whose seats were safe but who had aspirations for office would be disappointed.

Not content with this general threat, which in essence was a play upon the venality of such members as were biddable, there were a series of interviews with Conservative Anti-Marketeers conducted by you or your colleagues or your party whips (in some cases, I understand, by several of you). What transpired has naturally not been made public, but what may be inferred was succinctly stated by Mr. Enoch Powell when he asked: Who would complain if the political rewards of good behaviour and punishments for bad behaviour were sedulously applied to the wobblers and the waverers? He continued. "That is what promises and threats are for; and as hope and credulity spring eternal, there will always be a supply of the gullible who mistake a kindly word for a firm undertaking, or a frown for a sentence of political death."

That such trashy, buyable creatures should have the power of determining the destiny of a mighty nation must make you very happy, Edward Heath, in that the exploitation of their venality produced undeniable results. Of the 47 Tory Anti-Marketeers who went into the lobby against you in October, only fifteen had the guts and the integrity to do so again in February.

* * *

The methods used to reduce the original number to a point which enabled you to win your "overwhelming" victory were vile. Not only were the known dissidents approached in person, but the Central Office sent its paid hacks into their constituencies to try to organise political blackmail against them. Mr. Powell speaks witheringly of the situation created when "the apparatus of patronage and the system of bribes and threats is exported from Westminster to the country to constrain M.P.s to vote against what they know to be the wishes and believe to be the interests of their electors".

You must have been well aware, Edward Heath, that these despicable tactics were being employed to whip up support for your side, and you alone must bear the blame for the infamy. Most damnable of all was the threat to Ulster M.P.s and their constituents that if the party-line was not toed about entry into Europe, the British Government would withdraw its support from the Unionist cause in Northern Ireland. While the other measures were deeply dishonourable, this attempt at coercion on a matter of communal life and death was an act of political criminality of the worst kind—and

you, Edward Heath, will go down in history as the worst kind of political criminal and the most effective traitor to your country to have disgraced its annals.

One fact must surely have occurred to even the most dim-witted of your followers. The titanic pressures which have been brought to bear on Parliamentarians and their constituents, your own ruthless bulldozing of the nation without the least regard to common decency, your breakneck speed to plunge Great Britain into the European Economic Community long before its thousands of implications could be read, let alone understood, the sheer irresponsibility and blatancy of your lying—all these things proclaim, not just your personal enthusiasm for a cause but the carrying out of a design which the international banking and general business interests consider to be cardinal to their plan, incubated through many years, of building a political, financial, commercial and strategic One World monopoly of power.

* * *

Your own motivation is unknown to me. It cannot be supposed that the £36,000 prize awarded you by the FVS Foundation (created by the allegedly anti-Communist Herr Toepfer) and the additional £4,000 thrown in by some organisation in America were tied up in any way with your unprecedented fervour. When Mr. Harold Wilson (*The Times,* January 25) referred to you in the House of Commons as being "three times winner of the £38,000 prize for integrity from the Rotterness, Hartwell, Rees-Mogg foundation" I had no knowledge of any such set-up or of the awards made to you, but it does not occur to me that there is a cash nexus between you and the supranational cause you serve.

One thing, however, must be apparent to both of us. The bestowal upon you of large sums of money is an unquestionable indication of the quite abnormal importance attached to your labours by persons with power of patronage and with an unconcealed interest in supranational controls.

* * *

Apart from your impenetrable hide and your ruthless determination to push through issues without regard to the people's wishes or to any accepted principle, you are not a man of distinction: people do not discern in you any great percipience or other outstanding mental quality. You have been chosen to do a hatchet-job on Britain for no reason except your total lack of scruple. It is all the more ironical that our thousand years of freedom so faithfully guarded by the sea and the stout hearts of our forbears should be brought to an inglorious end through the agency of so very mediocre a person as yourself.

Though all the foundations in the world load honours upon you in its name, the fact remains, Edward Heath, that you are not a man of integrity. Your resort to falsehood and political blackmail of the most contemptible kind casts derision on that title. If you succeed in handing over this historic Realm to foreign control, which is what membership of the E.E.C. means, we shall regard you as the French regarded Laval—as the agent of the enemy in overall possession.

In that event we shall become the Free British and fight you with all the lawful means at our disposal until we die. Never shall we allow it to be said that in the hour of treason there were no Britons to keep faith with the past or hand down a torch to the future.

Yours faithfully,

A. K. Chesterton

ACCESSION AT EGMONT

The men of destiny
Shelter in the wings
And history
Is fashioned in the posturings
Of pawns.
The parrot cries
Of Statesmanship
Falls sweet on foreign ears
As states are rendered impotent
And suicide appears
An act of parliament.
Director and producer
Work unseen,
The climax of promotion
Shall be instant
And obscene—
An ultimate indignity.
Salesman/statesman
Needs not to dread
His fate
From severed head
Or lethal shot
He is inviolate
From patriot,
Yet shall indeed
Be seen to shrink,
Face lost,
Beneath
Black ink.
Uncertain Kingdom
Drain the glass,
Draw the curtain
As the island drama
Descends unto
A continental farce.

B. E. BIGGS
27.1.72

Read
SPEARHEAD
Edited by John Tyndall
Send for Specimen Copy to —
10 BIRKBECK HILL,
LONDON,
S.E.21

CUT AND THRUST

By A. K. CHESTERTON

IN a world where Prime Ministers, Cabinet Ministers, Leaders of the Opposition and Members of Parliament vote themselves huge salary increases "on the turn", it is difficult to assess the justice or otherwise of the miners' claim for a wage increase of 47 per cent. At any other time the claim would be considered grotesque, but what is the answer should the miners cite the example of the Parliamentarians? The miner does at least produce coal. What does Edward Heath produce other than the betrayal of his country?

However, that is not the essence of the matter. To strike is one thing (the law permits it), but to prevent power-stations from receiving reserves of coal or other kinds of fuel is something quite different. When the results of actions taken are such that the major part of our industrial life is brought to a halt, when our economic survival is threatened, then what we witness is nothing less than a war of attrition against the entire nation. When factional stampedes assume these proportions their effect is so devastating that the laws relating to treason should be extended to embrace those organisers who come what may are prepared to push the nation into the abyss. Indeed, where there is a political motive which links the forces of disruption with allegiance to the promoters of a foreign cause—as often there is—then the action taken is a form of High Treason and as such should it be treated.

* * *

The near wreck of the British economy revealed the Government's deplorable weakness. There were considerable reserves of coal—the huge dump in Birmingham in particular—which could have averted at least some of the misery caused by the strike. As the miners had been paid to dig the coal, its disposal was no concern of theirs. Yet when they placed pickets round the reserves, the Government tamely capitulated.

The same thing happened when pickets were posted to prevent other fuels reaching the power stations. Both actions were illegal. Yet no step was taken to enforce the law. Only when the miners' leaders graciously approved did the Government come to the aid of the British people. As its foreign policy is dictated from the United States, so is its home policy dictated by Transport House. At a time when strong men should be at the helm we are governed by weaklings.

* * *

The rampage of bodies allegedly representative of British university students on behalf of the striking coal-miners showed how little regard is paid these days to the interests of the British nation as a whole. During the General Strike in 1926 undergraduates were among the first to volunteer to man the steam-engines, drive the buses, and do other essential work. It was not that they bore any animosity towards the strikers, but simply their realisation that by one means or another the life of the community had to be kept ticking over. Forty-six years later, what a difference! Sectional interests tearing the nation to pieces now enjoy the support of those receiving university education paid for by the nation. There is no sense of communal obligation, let alone gratitude.

A pointer to the motivation of the student bodies has been their support of the terrorists in Northern Ireland. Let nobody be simple enough to suppose that what spurs them on is religious zeal. Their patron saint is not to be sought in Rome but wherever young Cöhn-Benditt happens to be these days. In the same way, light is thrown on the organisers of terror in Ulster. Not Catholics, they —but the New Left.

* * *

London has had a surfeit of marches and other demonstrations by aliens in support of causes remote from our shores. There have been Biafran marches and Nigerian counter-marches, Bangladesh demonstrations and Western Pakistan counter-demonstrations and Heaven knows how many other quaint factions imagining that their faces seen in processions down Whitehall register some favourable mark on the British people. There could be no greater delusion. Yet should the Common Market betrayal go through we may expect rival bands of Italians or Frenchmen or Germans or Dutchmen or Danes or what have you carrying banners and clenching fists marching to and fro ceaselessly between Trafalgar Square and Downing Street. Is it the intention that carbinierie or gendarmes or politzei should be brought over to deal with them and give the sorely-tried British Bobby a rest?

Of all the demonstrations in the past the most extraordinary was one in December reported thus in the *Jewish Observer*: "The first march on behalf of Syrian Jewry in Great Britain took place in London on Sunday. The march was organised by the Action Committee for Arab Jewry, a body consisting entirely of students". It started at Speakers' Corner and finished at Downing Street. Honestly, what was the Great British Public expected to do about it? Or about any of the others?

* * *

Readers interested in examples of double-speak are invited to study this superb specimen, splashed by *The Times* across three columns:

> "Now Parliament has to come to terms with a wholly new situation in which decisions affecting the lives of British citizens may be taken in a way which could elude any prior scrutiny in Parliament. To say this is not to argue that we shall suffer a loss of sovereignty."

Could any example be more wonderful!

At the first reading one recognises an outright contradiction. At a further glance one sees that the second sentence is false; that the argument is that we shall suffer a loss of sovereignty. The question left in one's

mind is what the hell did *The Times* intend by so brazen a piece of double-speak.

* * *

If the worthy members of the Pearce Commission turn in an honest report, as doubtless they will, it should make amusing reading. I am informed by an unimpeachable source that the following dialogue has taken place time after time. (It must be remembered by the reader that African leaders have impressed upon their followers the absolute necessity to say "no".)

Commissioner: "Are you in favour of this agreement?"

Assembled Africans: "*NO*".

Commissioner: "Are you in favour of African majority rule?"

Assembled Africans: "*NO*".

(Curtain!)

* * *

There was one art wherein the African demagogue leaves even the most hardened and unscrupulous Western politician in the shade—the art of sheer, unblushing hypocritical double-speak. I quote the British Labour Party's blue-eyed idol, His Excellency President Kaunda: "The demand for the one-Party state has become very strong, I have to respond as I believe in democracy". Incredible? Yes, but that is what the man said. It beats even the Heath lie that Britain's adherence to the European Economic Community does not entail any essential erosion of her sovereignty.

Those of us who are close students of the international scene knew exactly what the follow-on to the infantile Kaunda jargon would be—the arrest of Simon Kapepwe and his leading associates. (In the event no fewer than 120 of them were put in the "bag"). In days past *The Times* would have used forthright language in describing these events and the humbug which preceded them. Now, under the guidance of the egregious Rees-Mogg, it publishes a leading article headed "How To Deal with Zambia's Opposition". Threading its way with catlike delicacy through the "issues" involved—using the usual techniques "on the one hand" and "on the other hand", a bogus balance is struck wherein dear Kenneth is absolved. He is credited with the "suspicion" that Kapepwe & Co. had "improper relations with agents of South Africa". It is perhaps known to everybody except the denizens of Printing House Square that Kapepwe, the wild man of Zambian politics and an anti-White fanatic, is more likely to have had relations, proper or improper, with the agents of the lost continent of Atlantis!

* * *

While on the subject of Zambia, it is amusing to record a discovery which has been made that the country's bus services have been running at a loss since 1962. What is significant about that date? Simply that it was the year when Zambians were entrusted with the management of their own affairs.

Nobody can say that the discovery did not cause the authorities to act with speed. They decreed overnight that all fares should be doubled, without any prior announcement to the public. The result was that when would-be passengers arrived next morning with the money for the old fares, and no more, in their pockets, they were left at the stops surveying with melancholy eyes the back-side of whatever bus they had hoped to take. Good old Africa, it remains true to itself through all the ages!

* * *

Exactly what is happening in the Indian Ocean in general and the Persian Gulf in particular? Arab countries are disquieted by recent developments there and Bahrein has been asked to clarify whether or not it formed a pact with the United States allowing it to take over the former British naval base. There are contrary reports emanating from the U.S., which acknowledge that there has been a pact for the use of the base as a station for its Middle East fleet, whereas the Bahrein Foreign Ministry asserts that there has only been an exchange of letters giving the U.S. no more than refuelling and other ordinary docking facilities there. If the Bahrein version is correct it is a little difficult to explain the entry of six thousand United States troops to garrison the territory.

Meanwhile Washington has given Moscow the quite gratuitous assurance that the United States has no intention of building up naval power as a counter to Russian strength in the Indian Ocean. Why was there a necessity for any such statement? It cannot be supposed that the underlying idea was the creation of a power-vacuum in this enormously important strategical zone. As the Russians have already taken over the former British possession of Sokotra in the Persian Gulf and negotiated "fishing" rights in Mauritius, while the United States has obviously brought duresse to bear to replace the Royal Navy and the Royal Air Force in Bahrein, the inescapable conclusion is that the power-behind-the-scenes is still continuing to use the United States and the Soviet Union as instruments for the complete and final obliteration of Great Britain as a world power. What other explanation fits the facts? More specifically, what pressure was brought to bear on the gutless Heath Government to make it abandon our vital base in Bahrein?

* * *

There is a major battle taking place in the United States about which the outside world knows little or nothing. It concerns a book *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* written by Professor B. F. Skinner of Harvard. The theme is a statement of Skinner's belief that human freedom is a delusion and that human behaviour must be made to conform to the best interests of Society by a system of psychological controls. A better title would surely be "From Man to Ant". Quite a lot of this poisonous kind of propaganda has recently been heard in America. Jeremy Campbell, brilliant *Evening Standard* correspondent, gives as an example the recent statement to Congress of Dr. Reginald Laurie, President of a U.S. commission on the mental health of children: "There is serious thinking among researchers that perhaps we cannot trust the family alone to prepare young children for the new kind of world which is emerging. That is why the Soviets feel they need access

to infants. Remember that the brain grows fastest in the first eighteen months of life. It is more plastic and more available for appropriate experience and corrective intervention".

Other psychologists were quick to muscle-in. One, a certain Kenneth Clark, wrote that religion and moral philosophy, law and education are no longer appropriate in modern society and suggested that—wait for it!—"psychotechnological medication" be given, especially drugs to stimulate certain areas of the brain. But, as we shall see in the next note, the main centre of the storm is the Harvard professor.

* * *

Skinner's book has been succinctly described as "a blueprint for a state which uses the resources of science to condition the behaviour of its citizens. Evil though the entire concept undoubtedly is, the truly astounding fact to be faced is that a Government grant of £100,000 was made available for the research and writing of *Beyond Freedom and Dignity,* which proved to be a best-seller. Even worse, Skinner was awarded a handsome prize by the Joseph P. Kennedy Foundation, while an eminent psychologist told Campbell: "The President and Congress must take Skinner with the utmost seriousness".

This Congress has duly done! Congressman Cornelius Gallagher, writes Campbell, has discovered that Skinner's influence is pervasive and that his methods are being widely practised in American schools. Mr. Gallagher, after investigating the records of the bureaucracy, found that "tens of thousands of other behavioural projects are founded by the Pentagon, the Departments of Labour and Education, N.A.S.A. and the Atomic Energy Commission. Altogether millions of dollars are being spent in the search for some sort of Pavlovian basis upon which to build up conditioned American generations of the future. Here is a prediction by the National Educational Association: "Use will be made of drugs in schools to improve personality, concentration and memory. Schools are becoming clinics whose purpose is to provide individual psycho-social treatment for the student, thus increasing his value both to himself and to society. *Candour's* certainty that mankind is being softened-up for conspiratorial ends often evokes sneers from the ignorant, but what else can these projects betoken? Big Brother is in command and he is the Devil's agent here on earth.

* * *

The obverse side of the coin is shown in the Moscow trial last month of Vladimir Bukovsky. Ten years ago, when a very young man, Bukovsky became conscious that all was not well with the running of the Soviet state. It may be that the authorities thought that a person suffering from that "delusion" must be off his head: at any rate he was ordered to be detained in a mental hospital. Now there is no doubt that Russian prisons and labour camps are heartless places, but at least rules are laid down for their governance. In a "loony-bin", however, everything "goes", because who will prefer the word of a man adjudged mad to that of the men in whose custody he is placed? Bukovsky found life there "absolute hell". Being a man of spirit, when released he said so. Official wrath was again invoked, with the result that he was arrested and brought to trial.

The woman public prosecutor's indictment by-passed every issue, being the usual Communist propaganda rubbish. Bukovsky had eight former inmates present and ready to give evidence in support of what he had said, but not one was allowed to be called. He received a sentence of two years' imprisonment, followed by five years in a corrective labour camp and then five years in exile—twelve years in all for revealing the truth about a mental hospital!

* * *

Preparations for "political offenders" to be thrown into asylums in the United States have long been projected—Alaska is the chosen site—so that there will be a ready means of dealing with those who do not respond to Professor Skinner's conditioning methods. General E. A. Walker has already had a foretaste of the treatment. After making some slight criticism of the Pentagon while serving in Germany he was recalled on the instant, later framed and adjudged insane by a Dr. Charles Smith (born Cantor), placed in a plane (without being heard) which travelled hundreds of miles to an unknown destination (now known to have been the Federal Medical Prison at Springfield), placed in a maximum security cell seven foot by ten, stripped of all his clothing and had his meals served on the floor.

Had the General not had influential friends he would have been allowed to rot there. Who can say that the master-minds who plan such terrors are not in cahoots with their counter-parts in the Soviet Union? The conformity is all!

* * *

It has now become evident that illegal coloured immigration is taking place on a scale so large that police efforts to cope with it have been over-extended. Detective Superintendent Frank Taylor, of Preston, told the Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration: "Our enquiries lead us to believe that illegal immigration is widespread." This views seems to be shared by Mr. W. J. H. Palfrey, Chief Constable of Lancashire, who suggested to the Committee that the time had come to call an amnesty. "It would lessen our work considerably", he said. "An amnesty would wipe the slate clean. Then you could concentrate on tightening up."

The suggestion was made in the context of better educated immigrants exploiting the illiterates who had paid to get into Britain, which he rightly described as blackmail in the worst sence of the word. That, however, should not be regarded as a British problem. British interests demand that people illegally here should be rounded up and sent back. If the police have knowledge of immigrants who are being blackmailed they presumably have knowledge of their identity. One is justified in asking why Mr. Palfrey does not get cracking instead of asking that illegality should be made lawful.

Poor old William Shakespeare, he has to be "kept in his place". John Russell Taylor, one of the more precious critics employed by *The Times,* praises Roman Polanski's film of *Macbeth* for doing just that. "The important thing about putting Shakespeare on the screen", pontificates Taylor "is not to be intimidated by him". What this means is that the producer should not care a damn about Shakespeare's language (which he describes as having "misleading attractions!"), Shakespeare's sequences or indeed whatever it was that Shakespeare intended to convey. In other words, the producer is free to use Shakespeare in any way he pleases, however outrageously.

The result in Polanski's *Macbeth* is altogether remarkable. The theme is not, apparently, what we have all our lives thought it to be—a tragic tale about a man and woman whom ambition seizes by the throat and makes mad with lust for power, prompted by eerie emanations from the Celtic mist. No, no, we have been mistaken—ambition's not the thing. Can the reader guess what is? No? Then allow the understanding John Russell Taylor to explain. "Sex is the spur." Let not the matter be argued further, because the percipient John Russell Taylor tells us that it is "self-evident". I must confess that the only thing "self-evident" to me is the astounding impertinence of contemporary producers and their "highbrow" approvers. What matters is not the sublime genius of William Shakespeare, but an ability to cash-in upon it with distortions and stunts. Excitement! Excitement! The brilliant Roman Polanski has hit upon a wonderful innovation. The three weird sisters perform their witchcraft in the nude! Lady Macbeth does her sleep-walk—naked! Besides, Shakespeare does contribute something to the masterpiece—its title *Macbeth.* Would it not be more intellectually honest to hire a script-writer to churn out some quite different story under some other name?

A.K.C.

FINANCE AND THE MONOPOLISTS

By JOHN BULL

I ATTEMPT to answer two questions here; firstly, how precisely is financial control of our national life exercised, and secondly, what are the controllers aiming at. The first can be answered with some certainty; the second less so.

The first article in this series quoted the Governor of the Bank of Italy as saying, in effect, that banks by granting credit create money. If you are allowed to overdraw up to £1,000, you will probably issue cheques for this to others, who will bank them, so that at no time have any Bank of England notes or coins changed hands. Again, "Financial Statistics" (HMSO, August 1971) reckons the country's money supply at over £16,000 million, of which less than one quarter is notes or coins. Banks really have a licence to print money, and use this to acquire much of our real wealth, and, as important, to control the economy by varying the amount of money in circulation, so causing booms or slumps.

There is no real difference between a cheque and a bank-note, and formerly banks used to issue their own notes. By the 1844 Bank Act the Bank of England gradually acquired a monopoly of note issue (except for a small fiduciary issue by Scottish banks) and at the same time the right to lay down how much credit the other banks might create. This centralization of credit is alleged by many to be an explanation of the relative impoverishment of peripheral regions such as Scotland and Wales, and many of the more nationalistic writers on these matters favour a return to the old system, known as free banking. My view is that this is but an amelioration, and that no merely financial solution will save us.

Central banking in its modern form owes much to the Bank of England and to the Federal Reserve. The latter's charter was planned at a secret meeting held on Jekyll Island between Paul Warburg of Kuhn Loeb, representatives of J. P. Morgan and others. This charter was part of the Republican platform in 1912, and the democrats, winning the election with a promise not to implement that or any other Wall Street scheme, immediately put it into effect, the great crusader against financial domination, William Jennings Bryan, acting as their whip. The clause binding the Federal Reserve to issue money so as to keep prices constant was conveniently dropped, clearing the way for 1929.

* * *

Central banks used to be run by bankers, whether Norman of the Bank of England (Brown Shipley) or Warburg of the Federal Reserve. Recently there has been a move to semi-nationalization and their being staffed by technicians not drawn from private banks, but it was not observed that Messrs. Rothschild and Warburg were wringing their hands in despair as a result. The 1970 "First Report from the Select Committee on Nationalized Industries" states: ". . . control is not the essence of the relationship between the Treasury and the Bank (of England) . . . 'Co-operation' is the key word." Co-operation implies an independent power, and Sir George Bolton, a former Executive Director of the Bank wrote in The Banker (August 1970) that the Governor is ". . . the acknowledged leader of the London banking community which is easily the largest in the world. Therefore he is a person in his own right, and it is a matter of complete indifference whether the Bank is owned by private shareholders . . . or whether it is owned by the Government." Again, Fred Hirsch of the I.M.F. writes in "Money International" (Pelican) that the Governor of the Bank of Italy is

appointed for life, and, because of the perpetual chaos in that country runs most of its economic life—not the first case where communism benefits finance.

Many of the patriotic books which criticize finance do not distinguish clearly between the old system and the present, partly because the older system was simpler and has been more fully documented, and partly because a doubtless foreseen blessing of the Keynesian "euthenasia of the rentier" has been to instil conformity of thought into the more intelligent, who perforce can think of nothing else but the next penny. The old bankers concentrated on enormous thefts like those of 1873 and 1926 when by inducing a terrible slump they increased the value of bonds they held, and on building up huge trusts like the Rockefeller oil and drug empires. Since then the C.F.R., P.E.P. and similar bodies composed in more or less equal parts of bankers, socialist and communist politicians and administrators have brought about the new system. Its key features are: compulsory expansion, any firm not co-operating to be refused bank loans and government favour; confiscation by tax of half the national income to pay for state housing, medicine, schools, pensions and, ultimately, everything; rationalization involving take-overs on a national and international basis, and now the abolition of all nations.

* * *

Huge accumulations of money in strictly private hands are impossible, and the one-time merchant banker "king" of the J. P. Morgan style has to share his power with other financial institutions, with industry and with government. Your bankers are not disconsolate, however, for they have exchanged an absolute power in one sector of a country's life, for a share, probably as the spearhead, in a machine which runs all mankind. For example, expansion requires bank loans which are granted in return for a seat on the company's board. Take-overs are usually organized by merchant banks, and the new enlarged company is sure to be completely under their thumb. Again, just as the ancient Roman office-seeker had to run a cursus honorum of quaestor, aedile, etc., before becoming consul, so now in the Conservative Party promising young men are farmed out to merchant banks for a few years to learn the form. Possibly that is how Edward Heath was turned from the man who supported Imperial Preference at the 1948 Party Conference to the Ex-Brown Shipley employee whose only interest in life is to see the abolition of Great Britain and himself as Gauleiter of the island. Formerly banks had to commit their crimes in the knowledge that jail awaited the failure, for they were only one part of the economy and one power, if a great one, of many. Now we have a grand conclave of big industry, government (usually socialist, at least) insurance companies and clearing banks with, more often than not, a merchant banker in the pilot's seat, not so much because he exercises great power as because the others have been trained to think his way.

"Wealth" in origin means well-being, and this should mean secure possession of useful goods, a measure of independence, and an assurance of being able to live among one's family, friends and own nation. Industry could supply all these more abundantly, but its perversion by finance means that it does the very opposite. Instead of goods being better made, they are shoddier, because that is the only way more can be sold. Instead of food being better it is worse, and the only disagreement among experts is to what degree modern food is hurtful. Of course, if you are a food industry tycoon, and in addition have interests in the medicine business, then you could have two reasons for welcoming illnesses brought on by the fake food you sell! Indeed, you will be a health service enthusiast! Again, the possibility of producing more by machinery ought to mean more independent business, as there is more trade: instead universal monopoly and wage-slavery is the banker's recipe. Why should improved production methods mean that married women must work in factories, or that coloured and other immigrants be imported? The answer is that smashing the family and nation increases the financial complex's power in doing away with anything which gives a man independence.

* * *

Why have all the governments of the west made life easier for the criminal in face of a rise in violence which means that employees of the President of the U.S.A. are murdered almost on the steps of the White House, and that violent crime has risen twenty-fold in Britain as compared to pre-war days? Why are people like John Trevelyan, who said in January that every sort of pornographic writing should be legalised, appointed as film censor? Why have millions of immigrants, mainly coloured, been admitted to Britain, France, Holland, the U.S.A., and Canada when it is known that there never has in the history of the world been a country where two races have lived together on equal terms in peace? Why has the dread scourge of drugs been allowed to infect so much of our youth when firm steps at the beginning could have stopped them? Why has Britain, which won the war, been reduced to such a state that our representative in Libya advised British women to allow themselves to be raped by Arabs lest worse befall (the same advice as the U.S. Department of Justice now gives to American women in America)? Let the Gauleiter Heath answer in the words he used in Strasbourg on the 21st January: "Certainly, the Britain we bring into the New Europe is a New Britain, a Britain better suited for this great adventure than ever before. For while you have been building, we have not been idle."

You see that the bankers see with the inverted vision of hell, that evil is good and good evil. We see Detroit burnt down by negro rioters, goaded on by institutions financed by the Ford Foundation. Mr. Ford sees an enormous contract to rebuild the city, with the tiresome small businessmen, home-owners and other obstacles to progress removed at a stroke. We see the transformation of much of Britain into a drug-ridden haven for the pervert. The Gauleiter sees it as "better suited" than ever before—and so it is—for final extermination by

alien rule and limitless immigration and emigration. The banker (and his agents) cannot enjoy the good things of life, partly because he is perverse in a general sense and partly because he has destroyed them, so all that remains for him is power, first on a national scale and now on an international scale. All obstacles to that power must be eliminated, and that is why all nations, religions, races, and the family must go. Communism, which is now tied to finance, as described in the last article, has these aims, and so no-one can have been surprised to hear Heath saying, as he signed the Treaty of Accession to the EEC, that the next step must be union with the East.

CANDOUR LEAGUE IN THE BATTLE

By B. E. BIGGS

THE battle of the Common Market is now joined in earnest. Let no-one imagine that the shameful night of 28th October sealed the fate of this nation. What it did do was to kill once and for all any lingering hope that our political leaders would, in the end, find the manhood and integrity to stand to the defence of this country.

Outside Parliament that night members of the Candour League and other patriots demonstrated their abhorrence of the betrayal being plotted inside. All over the country the British people with varying degrees of despondency or passive anger. Beyond any shadow of doubt there is virtually no enthusiasm for our entry into the European Common Market.

> *Our task now—and there is time yet—is to convert that mass despondency into mass determination, and that passive anger into action.*

Those of us who are old enough to remember the events of the past few decades know how sunk in apathy the British people can be; how lethargic to the point of near-despair, so that our submergence appears inevitable. We also know, however, how we can be roused even at the last moment, to reassert our national pride and will to survive.

Our active helpers are, as yet, few but they are effective. A. K. Chesterton's booklet, *Common Market Suicide* has achieved an initial distribution all the more spectacular because of the unavoidable delay in publication, and the enormous forces of lying propaganda against which we are ranged. The response from Candour League members and our friends to the appeal for help in making the booklet known was splendid, and we are grateful to all those who played a part in the establishment of this effective broadside of common sense at home and abroad.

Throughout the months of negotiation with treachery, there has been much correspondence with the High Commissioners and Agents General for our kindred nations overseas. Every effort was made by the Candour League to rouse the leaders of all the peoples within the British world system to resist the betrayal which would be as damaging to them as to the people of these islands.

That effort had to be made, but it will surprise few to learn that no serious attempt at opposition was forthcoming from those we approached. The future of our peoples lies in our own hands and no other power is either able or willing to rescue us. It is to our own people that our efforts must be directed, and our propaganda must seek not merely to procure intellectual assent, but to rally the country into giving a resolute and unqualified refusal to surrender our national sovereignty.

In this, we have a tremendous advantage in that the trail has been blazed by *Candour*. No other patriotic body has its roots so deeply set in political truths and accurate prophecy as those afforded to the Candour League by *Candour* and the pen of A. K. Chesterton.

It is, therefore, imperative that we make the fullest use of our hard-won beginnings and our unique advantage, to achieve the concentration of all the forces working for the retention of British sovereignty into a dynamic unity. Only thus may the threatened odious dictatorship of international finance be averted.

There can be no better way to start than by finding—now—one more reader for *Candour*, and following this up with a real drive to get it into as many hands as possible. There have been many instances of people taking out (or accepting as a gift) a short-term subscription with little enthusiasm or conviction, but gradually appreciating the strength of our case and the need for active support.

If we do not soon reach the national consciousness of our people, we must fail. There are no more effective weapons to be had than those at our hand—*Candour* and the Candour League, and all are urged to use them to the full.

Tomorrow may be too late!

Act Now
Before the Treaty of Rome is Signed

Buy in quantities for mass distribution

COMMON MARKET SUICIDE

By A. K. Chesterton

Single Copies		25p	5 Copies		£1.00
10	„	£1.50	25	„	£3.50
50	„	£6.00	100	„	£10.00

All Post Free

From Candour Publishing Co.,
Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants.

Printed and Published by Candour Publishing Co., Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants.